



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,084	04/21/2005	Takashi Yasumura	80659(47762)	6480

21874 7590 08/11/2008
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

WU, IVES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1797

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/532,084	Applicant(s) YASUMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner IVES WU	Art Unit 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

(1). Applicants' Amendments and Remarks filed on 05/12/2008 have been received.

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 4 and 6-7 are cancelled before.

The objection of claim 1 in prior Office Action dated 1/10/2008 is withdrawn accordingly.

The rejections of claims 1-3, 5, 8-20 in prior Office Action dated 1/10/2008 is withdrawn in view of current Remarks.

However, a new ground of rejections for claims 1-3, 5 and 8-20 is introduced hereafter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

(2). **Claims 1-3, 8-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) in view of Butler (US6251308B1), evidenced by Fujimoto et al (WO02/44285) relied on English Translation (US07132460B2).

As to component (A) of a conductive filler in a conductive resin composition in **independent claim 1**, Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) disclose the electro-conductive agent, a variety of components such as carbon powders, carbon fibers and metal powders can be employed ([0015], line 1-7).

As to component (C) of a (meth)acrylate to be a reaction product obtained by reacting a polyetherpolyol having an aromatic cyclic structural unit and/or an aliphatic cyclic structural unit

Art Unit: 1797

with a (meth)acrylic acid, or a reaction product obtained by reacting a polyisocyanate having an aromatic cyclic structural unit and/or an aliphatic structural unit with a polyetherpolyol having an aromatic cyclic structural unit and/or an aliphatic cyclic structural unit under the conditions that an isocyanate group of the polyisocyanate is in excess of a hydroxyl group of polyol, with a (meth)acrylate having a hydroxyl group in **independent claim 1**, Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) disclose urethane (meth)acrylate formed by polyurethane oligomer and hydroxyC₂₋₆alkyl (meth)acrylate. The polyurethane oligomer includes a reaction product of diisocyanate and polyether diols such as polycarbonate diols - aromatic polyether diols (evidenced by Fujimoto et al (US07132460B2) that polycarbonate diols such as aromatic polycarbonate diol and aliphatic polycarbonate diol - Col. 4, line 17-18), the molar ratio of hydroxyl group to isocyanate group of the urethane oligomer is about 0.7/1 to 1.2/1 ([0049]). Therefore, the excess isocyanate group would completely reacted with hydroxyl group of (meth)acrylate, so that no active hydrogen atom is left.

As to the component (C) of a (meth)acrylate having a M_n of 500 to 10,000, which containing 20 to 80 wt% of an aromatic cyclic structural unit in **independent claim 1**, in view of substantially identical (meth)acrylate disclosed by prior art, and by applicants, it is examiner's position to believe that the (meth)acrylate of prior art would inherently possess M_n and aromatic structural unit as claimed. Since USPTO does not have facilities necessary to conduct the measurements. The burden now is shifted to applicants to prove otherwise. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

As to component (B) a urethane-modified epoxy (meth)acrylate obtained by reacting an epoxy (meth)acrylate (b-1) with a polyisocyanate (b-2); the epoxy (meth)acrylate (b-1) being obtained by an addition reaction of an epoxy resin having an aromatic cyclic structural unit and/or an aliphatic cyclic structural unit and a (meth)acrylic acid in a conductive resin composition in **independent claim 1**, Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) disclose radical-polymerizable resins, for example, vinyl ester-series resins, urethane (meth)acrylates and the like, can be used singly or in combination ([0018]). Vinyl-ester series Resin (e.g., epoxy (meth)acrylate) is a ring-opening and addition reaction product of an epoxy group with a carboxyl group of a compound having a α , β -ethylenically unsaturated bond, and is an oligomer having a α , β -ethylenically unsaturated bond such as (meth)acryloyl group at its terminal position

([0020], As the alicyclic epoxy resin, there may be mentioned, for example, alicyclic epoxy acetal, alicyclic diepoxy adipate and the like ([0025])). Okumura et al (US20030055030A1) **do not teach** the urethane-modified epoxy (meth)acrylate as claimed.

However, Butler (US06251308B1) **teaches** highly conductive molding compounds and fuel cell bipolar plates comprising these compounds (Title). One component of a molding resin composition is a cross-linkable prepolymer such as an unsaturated polyester resin or vinyl ester resin (Col. 4, line 1-3). An essential component to the improved molding composition is a rheological modifier, which may act to increase the molecular weight such as by chain extension of the resin prepolymer. Suitable modifiers include polyisocyanates. It is believed that the foregoing modifiers act chemically by co-reacting into the polymer backbone at carboxy or hydroxyl sites (Col. 5, line 20-27). The modifiers are further used in general to enable the achievement of a high definition conductive polymeric fuel cell plate (Col. 5, line 40-42). Resin F is 580-05 from Reichhold Chemicals, Inc. It is characterized as a urethane-modified vinyl ester resin (Col. 8, line 6-7).

The advantage of urethane-modified vinyl-ester resin is to get a higher glass transition temperature and resulted in an improvement in the hot strength of the molded part. Further improvement are also possible by optimizing both gel time and cure time for the prepolymer by controlling initiator type and amount (Col. 3, line 35-41). Further these compositions enable the production of thin and intricate specimens that have high concentrations of conductive filler (Col. 3, line 59-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use urethane-modified vinyl ester resin disclosed by Butler for the vinyl-ester resin of Okumura et al for a combination with Urethane (meth)acrylate in order to attain the above-cited advantages.

As to component (D) of other ethylenically unsaturated monomer in **independent claim 1**, and **claim 11**, Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) radical-polymerizable diluent such as aromatic vinyl ester, in particular, styrene ([0058]-[0060]).

As to the epoxy(meth)acrylate having a hydroxyl value in the range of 100 to 300, the molar ratio of moles of hydroxyl group of the epoxy (meth)acrylate to moles of isocyanate group of the polyisocyanate being within the range of 1.0/(0.5 to 1.5) in **independent claim 1**, Butler (US06251308B1) discloses desirable amounts of polyisocyanate modifiers to be from about 1 to

Art Unit: 1797

about 15 weight percent. This can also be expressed as from about 0.5 to about 20 phr (Col. 6, line 7-13), it would meet the range of mole ratio as claimed. in view of the substantially identical epoxy (meth)acrylate disclosed by Applicants, and by prior art, it is examiner's position to believe that the epoxy (meth)acrylate of prior art would inherently possess the hydroxyl value in the range of 100 to 300 as claimed. Since USPTO does not have facilities necessary to conduct the measurements. The burden now is shifted to applicants to prove otherwise. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

As to the limitation of **claims 2 and 3**, Okumura et al disclose the novolac type epoxy and other type of epoxy resin in paragraph (3) which includes 30 to 90 wt% of an aromatic cyclic structural unit and/or an aliphatic cyclic structural unit.

As to the limitation of **claim 8**, in absence of showing the criticality of the records, the optimization value of ratio between component (b) of urethane-modified epoxy (meth)acrylate and component (c) of (meth)acrylate to be 95/5 to 50/50 in a known process renders *prima facie obviousness* within one ordinary skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980).

As to the limitation of **claim 9**, Okumura et al disclose the wt ratio of the electroconductive agent to the radical-polymerizable thermosetting resin system is from 55/45 to 95/5 ([0063], line 1-3), in other words, the content of component A is to be 55 to 95 wt%.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumura et al (US20020055030A1).

As to the limitation of **claim 10**, Okumura et al disclose the thermosetting to be 12 wt%, reactive diluent (styrene) to be 8 wt%, conductive fillers to be 80 wt% in Example 2, it would be obvious to have the distribution of components B, C such as 6 wt% of B and 4 wt% of urethane-(meth)acrylate C taught by Okumura to be within 12 wt% and to meet the instant claim.

As to limitation of **claims 13-20**, Okumura et al disclose the separator for solid polymer-type fuel cell being produced by molding the resin composition which comprises an electroconductive agent and a radical-polymerizable thermosetting resin system and a resin molding method (Abstract, line 1-4).

As to components (A) – (D) in 1st step method for producing a conductive resin composition in **independent claim 12**, the disclosure of Okumura et al is incorporated herein by

reference, the most subject matters of components, and hydroxyl values, molar ratio as currently claimed, have been recited in applicants' claim 1, and have been discussed therein.

As to kneading step in the method in **independent claim 12**, Okumura et al disclose the resin composition is kneaded with the use of conventional kneader ([0082], line 1-2).

As to 2nd step of reacting the kneaded mixture at a temperature of room temperature to 80 °C in the method in **independent claim 12**, Okumura et al disclose the reaction for 8 hours at 120 °C in Example 1. In absence of showing the criticality of the records, the optimized reaction temperature ranged from room temperature to 80 °C in the known process renders *prima facie obviousness* within one of ordinary skills in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980).

(3). **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) in view of Butler (US06251308B1), further in view of Numa et al (US05886082A).

As to the limitation of **claim 5**, Okumura et al disclose the diols such as polyoxyC₂₋₄alkylene glycols, polyester diols, polycarbonate diols ([0048], line 11-13). Okumura et al **do not teach** polyether polyol to be alkylene oxide adduct of a multinucleate phenolic compound.

However, Numa et al (US05886082A) **teach** polyether diols such as alkylene oxide adduct of bisphenol A, polyethylene glycol, polypropylene glycol and the like (Col. 11, line 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at time the invention was made to substitute the polyoxyC₂₋₄alkylene glycol disclosed by Okumura et al with the polyether diol of alkylene oxide adduct of bisphenol A for the diol component of Okumura et al based on their interchangeability as recognized functional equivalence as polyether diols.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 9-11, Remarks, filed 05/12/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under Okumura et al (US20020055030A1) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

Art Unit: 1797

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Okumura et al (US20020055030A1), Butler (US06251308B1) and Fujimoto et al (US07132460B2).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to IVES WU whose telephone number is (571)272-4245. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner: Ives Wu

Art Unit: 1797

Date: August 7, 2008

/Duane S. Smith/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

8-7-08